

***In the Drawings:***

Please replace drawing sheet 7, containing Figure 11, with the replacement drawing sheet 7 filed herewith and marked as "Replacement Sheet."

## **REMARKS**

### ***Amendments to the Claims***

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 3-8 and 16 remain pending in the application. Of the pending claims, claims 3 and 16 are independent. Claims 3-8 have been rejected and claim 16 has been allowed. Reconsideration of the claims after entry of the present Amendment and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### ***I. Objection to the Drawings***

The Examiner has objected to Figure 11 in the drawings as not being labeled "PRIOR ART." The replacement drawing sheet filed herewith adds the legend requested by the Examiner. No other changes have been made to Figure 11 or the remaining drawings. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

#### ***II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

The Examiner has rejected claims 3-8 as failing to meet the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 3-8 are essentially identical to claims 3-8 from the original application which were allowed by the Examiner in the Office Action of July 12, 2006. Claim 3 was rewritten in independent form upon the suggestion of the Examiner and minor amendments were made to overcome a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The claimed "random noise variance" has support in the specification. This refers to the "intrinsic noise in the CT acquisition process" discussed at line 10 of page 7

of the originally filed specification. This same sentence provides the support for “controlling the compression by specifying a maximum allowable error between a reconstructed pixel value and an original pixel value to be within two standard deviations of a random noise variance.” Although this paragraph does not specify that such a maximum allowable error is to be within two standard deviations of the noise variance, the specification does indicate that this maximum allowable error should be “some multiple of the intrinsic noise.” (*Id.*) One of ordinary skill in the art would readily be able to ascertain from the originally filed specification, including the originally filed claim 3, that it would be optimal to select a maximum allowable error within two standard deviations of the noise variance.

With respect to claim 4, the passage cited by the Examiner at lines 6-9 of page 7 of the originally filed specification dealing with the error count, is in fact, the same error count referred to in claim 4. Thus, claim 4 has support in the originally filed specification.

### ***III. Conclusion***

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 3 and 16 are allowable over the prior art of record. For similar reasons, Applicants urge that the dependent claims are also allowable.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the

Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/matthew a rosenberg/  
Matthew A. Rosenberg, Reg. #40149  
Thompson Coburn LLP  
One US Bank Plaza  
St. Louis, Missouri 63101  
Telephone: 314-552-6007  
Fax: 314-552-7007  
mrosenberg@thompsoncoburn.com